

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 21, 2006. Claims 1-9, 12-23, 26-31 and 34-45 were pending in this application. Claims 1-45 have been canceled. Claims 46-90 are added and are now pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case in view of the following remarks.

**Summary of Interview**

Applicants, thorough its attorneys, Bradley P. Williams (Reg. No. 40,227) and Ryan S. Loveless (Reg. No. 51,970), interviewed Examiner Shahid Alam and Examiner Kuen Lu on March 23, 2007 (“Examiner Interview”). Applicants appreciate Examiners’ time. During the Examiner Interview, the Examiners and Applicants discussed the Non-Final rejection and the *Urbano* reference.

**Section 103(a) Rejections**

Claims 1-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in the present Office Action over the combination of various references. Although applicants disagree, Applicants have nonetheless cancelled Claims 1-45.

**New Claims**

New Claims 46-90 have been presented. Support for these new claims includes, but is not limited, to page 11 and pages 25-28 of Applicant’s specification.

Independent Claims 72 is believed to be allowable because the applied references, alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest the following feature:

determining, based on the collected energy consumption information, whether a predetermined event has occurred;

if a predetermined event has not occurred, processing the energy consumption information to one or more reduced storage intensive values representing energy consumption information for a period of time and transmitting the one or more reduced storage intensive values; and

if a predetermined event has occurred, preserving event analysis information that includes at least a portion of the energy consumption information collected before the predetermined event and energy

consumption information collected after the predetermined event, and transmitting the event analysis information.

For at least the foregoing reason, Independent Claim 72 and its dependents should be allowed. The remaining claims should be allowed for analogous reasons.

**No Waiver**

All of Applicants' arguments and amendments are without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to discuss the other distinctions between the applied references and the claims in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's statements. The example distinctions discussed by Applicants are sufficient to overcome the anticipation and obviousness rejections.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Attached is an authorization for a one month extension of time. Applicants believe no additional fee is due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

*Ryan S. Loveless*

Ryan S. Loveless  
Reg. No. 51,970  
(214) 953-6913

Date: April 20, 2007

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number: **05073**  
Attorney Docket No.: 017575.0490